

Remarks

By this paper, Applicants amend independent claims 1, 14, 27 & 28 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim certain aspects of the present invention. Specifically, Applicants recite that the group of logical partitions are part of a logical partition cluster within the computing environment, wherein the logical partition cluster resides on a common physical processor and the group of logical partitions of the logical partition cluster cooperatively share resources of the logical partition cluster and have workloads and resources managed by one or more cooperating workload managers. Applicants' independent claims are further amended to specify that the one or more workload goals include for a workload executing within the group of logical partitions of the logical partition cluster an expected completion time for the workload and an importance of the workload relative to at least one other workload executing within the group of logical partitions of the logical partition cluster. The workload and the another workload are executing in either the same logical partition or different logical partitions of the logical partition cluster. Support for the above-noted amendments can be found throughout the application as filed. For example, reference page 5, lines 21-26; page 15, line 1 – page 17, line 28; page 49, lines 17-21; and page 60, line 10 – page 65, line 22. Thus, no new matter is added to the application by any amendment presented. With the addition of new dependent claims 48 & 49, claims 1, 5, 6, 11-14, 18, 19, 24-28, 32, 33, 38-42, 48 & 49 are now pending.

In the Office Action, all prior pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeurer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,301,323; hereinafter Maeurer), in view of Bostick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,253,344; hereinafter Bostick), and further in view of D'Errico (U.S. Patent No. 6,434,637 B1; hereinafter D'Errico). This rejection is respectfully traversed to any extent deemed applicable to the claims presented herewith, and reconsideration thereof is requested.

In amended independent claim 1, for example, Applicants recite: determining that the I/O configuration is to be adjusted using one or more workload goals *of a logical partition cluster*. The logical partition cluster includes a group of logical partitions residing on a common physical processor, wherein the group of logical partitions of the logical partition cluster cooperatively share resources of the logical partition cluster and have workloads and resources managed by one or more cooperating workload managers.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied or known art teaches the existence of a logical partition cluster *per se*, as defined in accordance with Applicants' claims, wherein the logical partition cluster includes a group of logical partitions residing on a common physical processor, and cooperatively sharing resources of the logical partition cluster and having workloads and resources managed by one or more cooperating workload managers. Applicants respectfully submit that Maeurer, Bostick and D'Errico, alone and in combination, do not teach this aspect of Applicants' invention.

The concept of a logical partition cluster (comprising a group of logical partitions residing on a common physical processor having cooperating workload managers for managing workloads and resources of the group of logical partitions) is new to the present application, and to the applications co-filed herewith, for which U.S. Letters Patents have now issued. Since this concept of a logical partition cluster, defined as recited in Applicants' independent claims, is not taught or suggested in the applied or known art, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims presented patentably distinguish over the applied art.

In addition, Applicants independent claims are amended to recite that the one or more workload goals that are considered include for a workload executing within the group of logical partitions of the logical partition cluster *an expected completion time for the workload and an importance of the workload relative to another workload executing within the group of logical partitions of the logical partition cluster*. Further, Applicants recite that the workload and the another workload are executing in either the same logical partition or different logical partitions of the group of logical partitions of the logical partition cluster. This recited aspect of Applicants' invention relates to the logical partition cluster and to the cooperating workload manager(s), which manage workloads and resources of the group of logical partitions across logical partitions. A careful reading of the applied art fails to uncover any discussion of workloads within logical partitions being managed across logical partitions by cooperating workload manager(s) of a logical partition cluster.

In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that Maeurer does not teach a group of logical partitions residing on a common physical processor, let alone cooperating workload manager(s) which manage workloads and resources across the plurality of logical partitions. The

phrase “logical partition” is a term of art which conventionally is a division of a computer’s processor, memory and storage into multiple sets of resources so that each set of resources is operated independently with its own operating system instance and applications. Typically, each partition communicates with the other partitions as if the other partitions are in a separate machine. Thus, in accordance with Applicants’ invention, the concept of a logical partition cluster is superimposed, wherein cooperating workload manager(s) manage resources cooperatively shared by the logical partitions of the group of logical partitions of the cluster, and manages workload within the respective logical partitions. Applicants’ independent claims presented herewith specify how the workload is managed, and more particularly, how an I/O configuration is adjusted dynamically during management of the workload for different logical partitions in the logical partition cluster.


For at least the above-noted reasons, the independent claims presented are believed to patentably distinguish over the applied and known art.

The dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as for their own additional characterizations. In this regard, Applicants’ new dependent claims 48 & 49 specify that the selecting is further based, in part, on determining an entropy index resulting from selecting the particular channel path. This concept of an entropy index is unique to the present invention, and is also recited in the U.S. Letters Patent resulting from the co-filed, commonly assigned U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/407,453, entitled “Method, System and Program Products for Determining I/O Configuration Entropy”. None of the applied or known art determines an entropy index as recited by Applicants in evaluating and selecting a channel path from a plurality of channel paths to be used in adjusting I/O configuration of a logical partition cluster. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that new dependent claims 48 & 49 patentably distinguish over the known art.

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Should any issue remain unresolved, however, Applicants' undersigned representative requests a telephone interview with the Examiner to further discuss the matter in the hope of advancing prosecution of the subject application.

Respectfully submitted,


Kevin P. Radigan, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,789

Dated: December 19, 2008

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579